REMARKS

Claims 1-39 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 12, 22 and 31 are independent claims. Claims 12-14, 17 and 31 are amended. Claims 3, 5-6 and 15-16 have been previously canceled. Claims 40-56 are added. Claims 1, 2, 4, 7-14 and 17-56 are pending. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claim 12 is objected to because of informalities. In light of the amendment made to claim 12, this objection is now moot. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to claim 12 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-14, 17, 19-22, 24-26, 28, 30-35, 37 and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0112789 to Heinonen et al. (hereinafter "Heinonen") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,728,232 to Hasty, Jr. et al. (hereinafter "Hasty") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,370,380 to Norefors et al. (hereinafter "Norefors"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action also indicated that claims 5, 8, 15, 18, 23 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0112789 to Heinonen et al. (hereinafter "Heinonen") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,728,232 to Hasty, Jr. et al. (hereinafter "Hasty") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,370,380 to Norefors et al. (hereinafter "Norefors"). However, the Examiner noted during a telephone call by Applicants' representative to clarify which claims are rejected, that the rejection of claims 5, 8, 15, 18, 23 and 32 is in error and should be disregarded. Therefore, the rejection of claims 5, 8, 15, 18, 23 and 32 is not addressed below.

Applicants submit that the combination of Heinonen, Hasty and Norefors does not teach or suggest the combination of elements recited in claims 1-15, 17-26, 28, 30-35, 37 and 39 and newly added claims 40-56. Independent of claim 1, in part, recites "the code and the wide area identification are to be coupled into a hashed code for proximity identification of the mobile

13

device, and wherein the hashed code is to be transmitted to the mobile device along with an instruction to forward the hashed code to the network server to associate the code and the wide area identification in a subsequent request for service by the mobile device."

Independent claim 12, in part, recites "coupling the first and second identifications in a hashed code as a proximity identification of the mobile device; and transmitting a message to the mobile device including the hashed code and instructing the mobile device to forward the message to the server for associating the first identification with the second identification in a subsequent request for service by the mobile device."

Independent claim 22, in part, recites "means for registering to obtain a first, local identifier associated with the mobile device and to request and obtain a second, network identifier associated with the mobile device; means for transmitting a code and a message to the mobile device for identification purposes in short-range and network communications, wherein the code comprises a hashed code formed from the first and second identifiers, and wherein the message comprises an instruction to the mobile device to send the code to the service provider to associate the first and second identifiers for a subsequent request for service."

Independent claim 31, in part, recites "registering the mobile device when initiating proximity services with the service provider, including obtaining a first, local identifier associated with the mobile device and requesting and obtaining a second, network identifier associated with the mobile device; transmitting a message, including a code, to the mobile device for identification purposes in short-range and network communications, wherein the code comprises a hashed code based on the first and second identifiers, and wherein the message comprises an instruction to the mobile device to send the code to the service provider to associate the first and second identifiers for a subsequent request for service." Heinonen does not teach or suggest these features.

The Office Action acknowledged that Heinonen does not teach or suggest that "the code and the wide area identification are to be coupled into a hashed code for proximity identification of the mobile device," as recited in the pending claims. However, the Office Action cited Hasty to cure this deficiency.

Hasty does not cure any of the deficiencies of Heinonen. Hasty discloses that a receiving node maintains a local ad-hoc routing table based on the routing advertisements. The maintained

data is used to answer intercepted ARP and DHCP requests at the node. See at least Col. 6, line 56- Col. 7, line 12. There is no teaching or suggest in Hasty that the hashed MAC address and IP address are for proximity identification of the mobile device," as alleged in the Office Action. Instead, Hasty only discloses that the local ad-hoc table with the hashed IP and MAC addresses are used to answer intercepted ARP and DHCP requests at the node.

The Office Action also acknowledged that Heinonen does not teach or suggest that "the hashed code is to be transmitted to the mobile device along with an instruction to forward the hashed code to the network server to associate the code and the wide area identification in a subsequent request for service by the mobile device." But, the Office Action cited Norefors to cure this deficiency.

Norefors also does not cure any of the deficiencies of Heinonen or Hasty. The cited section of Norefors merely discloses that a message, including an encrypted security token and hash code, is transmitted to a mobile node where it is deciphered and re-encrypted with another encryption key. The second encryption key is shared by the mobile node and a second access point. The re-encrypted message is sent from the mobile node to the second access point where it is deciphered using the shared encryption key. A communications link is established between the mobile node and the second access point to achieve a secure handover, if the second access point authenticates the mobile node based on the deciphered security token and hash code. See at least Col. 2, lines 17-37 of Norefors.

Norefors does not teach or suggest that the hashed code is forwarded "to the network server to associate the code and the wide area identification in a subsequent request for service by the mobile device." In Norefors, handover from one access point to another access point occurs if the second access point authenticates the mobile node based on the deciphered security token and hash code. There is no teaching or suggestion in Norefors of associating the content of the hash code "(the code and the wide area identification) in a subsequent request for service by the mobile device," as recited in the pending claims. As is known to one skilled in the art, handover or handoff, as discussed in Norefors, is the transition of the mobile node from one access point or base station to another access point or base station as the mobile node moves around. Handover is performed to prevent call termination as the mobile node moves around. Handover is not associated with forwarding the hashed code "to the network server to associate

the code and the wide area identification in a subsequent request for service by the mobile device," as alleged in the Office Action.

The combination of Heinonen, Hasty and Norefors fails to teach or suggest each of the elements recited in claims 1, 12, 22 and 31. Each of claims 2, 4, 7, 9-11, 13-14, 17, 19-21, 24-26, 28, 30, 32-35, 37 and 39 depends on claims 1, 12, 22 and 31, and therefore, incorporates all of the elements of claims 1, 12, 22 and 31 in addition to the further limitations recited in claims 2, 4, 7, 9-11, 13-14, 17, 19-21, 24-26, 28, 30, 32-35, 37 and 39. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 9-14, 17, 19-22, 24-26, 28, 30-35, 37 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn.

Claims 27 and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Heinonen in view of Hasty and Norefors, and in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0046184 to Bjorklund et al. (hereinafter "Bjorklund"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Bjorklund does not cure any of the deficiencies of Heinonen, Hasty and Norefors, as outlined above. Specifically, Bjorklund does not teach or suggest "means for registering to obtain a first, local identifier associated with the mobile device and to request and obtain a second, network identifier associated with the mobile device; means for transmitting a code and a message to the mobile device for identification purposes in short-range and network communications, wherein the code comprises a hashed code formed from the first and second identifiers, and wherein the message comprises an instruction to the mobile device to send the code to the service provider to associate the first and second identifiers for a subsequent request for service," as recited in claim 27. Bjorklund also does not teach or suggest "registering the mobile device when initiating proximity services with the service provider, including obtaining a first, local identifier associated with the mobile device and requesting and obtaining a second, network identifier associated with the mobile device; transmitting a message, including a code, to the mobile device for identification purposes in short-range and network communications, wherein the code comprises a hashed code based on the first and second identifiers, and wherein the message comprises an instruction to the mobile device to send the code to the service provider to associate the first and second identifiers for a subsequent request for service," as

recited in claim 36. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection of claims 27 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn.

Claims 29 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Heinonen in view of Hasty and Norefors, and in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0127204 to Belmont (hereinafter "Belmont"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Belmont does not cure any of the deficiencies of Heinonen, Hasty and Norefors, as outlined above. Specifically, Belmont does not teach or suggest "means for registering to obtain a first, local identifier associated with the mobile device and to request and obtain a second, network identifier associated with the mobile device; means for transmitting a code and a message to the mobile device for identification purposes in short-range and network communications, wherein the code comprises a hashed code formed from the first and second identifiers, and wherein the message comprises an instruction to the mobile device to send the code to the service provider to associate the first and second identifiers for a subsequent request for service," as recited in claim 29. Belmont also does not teach or suggest "registering the mobile device when initiating proximity services with the service provider, including obtaining a first, local identifier associated with the mobile device and requesting and obtaining a second, network identifier associated with the mobile device; transmitting a message, including a code, to the mobile device for identification purposes in short-range and network communications, wherein the code comprises a hashed code based on the first and second identifiers, and wherein the message comprises an instruction to the mobile device to send the code to the service provider to associate the first and second identifiers for a subsequent request for service," as recited in claim 38. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection of claims 29 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn.

Disclaimer

Applicants may not have presented all possible arguments or have refuted the characterizations of either the claims or the prior art as found in the Office Action. However, the lack of such arguments or refutations is not intended to act as a waiver of such arguments or as concurrence with such characterizations.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, consideration and allowance are respectfully solicited.

In the event the Examiner believes an interview might serve in any way to advance the prosecution of this application, the undersigned is available at the telephone number noted below.

The Office is authorized to charge any necessary fees to Deposit Account No. 22-0185.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 22-0185, under Order No. 27592-00449-US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: November 13, 2008   Respectfully submitted,

                                        Electronic signature: /Arlene Neal/
                                        Arlene Neal
                                           Registration No.: 43,828
                                        CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP
                                        1875 Eye Street, NW
                                        Suite 1100
                                        Washington, DC 20006
                                        (202) 331-7111
                                        (202) 293-6229 (Fax)
                                        Attorney for Applicant